

EX-10111 OR LATE FILED

From: Sondra Singer
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Thu. Mar 20, 2003 12:12 AM
Subject: Deregulation of media issue

MB-02-277

March 19, 2003

RECEIVED

To: FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell

MAR 25 2003

Commissioners Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Kevin J. Martin, Michael J. Copps

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner:

I have personally worked in radio for the better part of the last 23 years. I have never liked the idea of deregulation because I could foresee what would happen if a very few people controlled the media. The original reasoning behind ownership regulation was to defend the ideas of free speech and to assure that we, the public, received diverse opinions from our media sources.

What has happened in the past 11 years of deregulation of radio is that two companies control the vast majority of our stations. The "economies of scale" that they have put forth have caused our media to become homogenized. What's good for Los Angeles is good for Ft. Collins, Colorado. And, that simply isn't always true. Before deregulation, if there was a fire in town, you could find a local radio station to report it. Today, you generally can't find immediate local news. A consumer can't find out what is going on, unless it is part of a scheduled traffic report. Not only that, but opinions, once upon a time, were diverse. Today, they reflect the opinions of the managers who hire the personalities. I had to laugh, ironically, a few weeks ago, when a Clear Channel talk personality was defending Clear Channel, saying that he could voice whatever opinion he wanted. The reason I laughed was that they wouldn't have hired him in the first place if he didn't agree with their philosophies. Music is also being restricted by these large conglomerates. We Americans have many voices, but conglomerate ownership has one. This can hardly be deemed "broadcasting in the public interest." Plus, allowing companies like Clear Channel to also own concert promotion companies and other related businesses restricts free trade and favors their own media properties. This monopolizing of news and entertainment has got to stop!

We need to encourage independent ownership and diversity of programming. There was inherent wisdom in earlier FCC rulings that imposed strict limits on the amount of stations one company could own. The same may be said of FCC rules prohibiting one company from owning a broadcasting station and a newspaper in the same market.

The idea that the FCC may further loosen ownership rules is scary to me. The time has come to rescind the previous relaxations of these rules, to re-impose ownership limits, to reinstate rules requiring annual local programming assessments, and to force media behemoths like Clear Channel and Infinity to diversify their holdings.

To allow the most popular sources of news, information and entertainment to be owned by a small handful of people across the nation and in any one community is extremely dangerous for our democratic process.

Thank you,

Sondra Singer

Lakewood, Colorado

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: Mitchell, Anais
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu, Mar 13.2003 12:50 PM
Subject: deregulation

RECEIVED

MAR 25 2003

Dear Chairman Powell,

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I am writing to you both as a citizen who values media diversity and as a DJ at an independently-owned radio station to urge you not to further deregulate the radio industry in this country. I understand the value of the free market and government non-intervention, but it is also clear to me that deregulation in today's climate **is** synonymous with corporate consolidation- a trend which is particularly dangerous when it comes to the media. It is vital citizens' education, musical integrity, and democracy in general that our media sources be diverse, and that any given locality have a competitive number of media (radio) options. Please reject further deregulation of the radio industry- once consolidation has begun, it **is** difficult to backtrack- and this issue is one of the most vital to our nation's health and security. Please respond and let me know how you plan to act. Thank you,

Anais.

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

From: Frank Brown
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, Mar 22, 2003 5:33 PM
Subject: deregulation feedback

MAR 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

FCC Chairman and Commissioners:

Just a quick note to let you know I am opposed to the media deregulation proposal. I believe we (the american public) need more diversity of opinion, not less. Deregulation would further stifle the already scant diversity seen on the airwaves. I believe my government should try to strengthen democracy, rather than stifle it. Which means we should prevent a handful of large media giants from dominating. OK?

Thank you for your consideration

-Frank Brown
4401 Baker Ave NW
Seattle WA
<http://www.inwa.neff-frog>
frog-dc@inwa.net

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

EX-100 PARTIAL OR LATE FILED RECEIVED

From: Jean Cassels
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, Mar 16, 2003 9:33 AM
Subject: deregulation

MAR 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I strongly oppose deregulation of the media. We need more voices, not fewer!
Thank you,
Jean Cassels
New Orleans LA

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

From: Dorothy Conway
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Mar 17, 2003 7:00AM
Subject: Don't allow monopoly of media channels

MAR 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner Powell:

Numerous reports agree that the Federal Communications is planning to loosen longstanding rules governing control of the media that bring news and views to the American public. This will inevitably lead to monopoly, by a few large corporate giants, of TV stations, newspapers, and broadcast networks.

I urge you, Commissioner Powell, to halt immediately any implementation of these these FCC plans that threaten public access to diverse views and information.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Conway
2419 N Drake
Chicago, IL 60647

Get Your Private, Free Email at <http://www.hotmail.com>

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

From: Alexis Cunningham
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Mar 17, 2003 11:11 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

MAR 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Alexis Cunningham (loopaa_2000@yahoo.com) writes:

Commissioner Adelstein:

I really like to know your views on the re-ownership rule changes. Do you **feel** that they will or will not be effective? From what I understand monopolies are not a good thing because they only address one particular persons view points, which in turn, cuts out diversity and different creativity What is your view on that issue as well?

Please e-mail me back as soon as possible

Sincerely

Alexis Cunningham

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 205.129.164.35
Remote IP address: 205.129.164.35

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

From: kerry Hart
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, Mar 22, 2003 3:15 AM
Subject: Do NOT Deregulate the Media

MAR 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

You guys have to know this would take any **last** semblance of fairness from the American media. As much as power and money motivate many these days, do any of **us** really want to live in the old Soviet Union? Of course, things are already going in that direction, **as** far as the U.S. newscorp goes. If it ultimately happens, I think it may backfire and outlet after outlet will die on the vine as Americans, who probably aren't quite as stupid as some people think, wise up to what's happening and abandon tv & print news for the Internet.

Providence, RI

kerry Hart
triknite@earthlink.net
Why Wait? Move to EarthLink

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB. Commissioner Adelstein

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: Nathan Hawks
To: Kathleen Abernathy. Commissioner Adelstein, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Mike Powell
Date: Sat, Mar 22, 2003 12:37 AM
Subject: Stop media conglomeration!

RECEIVED

Ma'ams and Sirs;

You need to tighten, not loosen, restrictions on media buy-ups!

Do not loosen rules on media conglomeration!

Nathan Hawks
7056 Poncede Leon Ave #3A
Jacksonville, FL 32217

=====

There's a mass without roofs, a prison to fill.
There's a country's soul that reads, "post no bills."
There's a strike, and a line of cops outside of tha mill.
There's a right to obey, and a right to kill.
--Rage Against the Machine
--"Calm like a Bomb"

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Platinum -Watch CBS' NCAA March Madness, live on your desktop!
<http://platinumyahoo.com>

MAR 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

From: Larry Hurlock
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu. Mar 20, 2003 11:58 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

RECEIVED

MAR 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Larry Hurlock (larrynorth@alaska.com) writes:

Re: Relaxation of consolidated ownership rules

In the United States, a "pay press" society, diversity must be protected.

Also, why is it so hard to file a comment. There are no clear directions to commenting on this subject, and I certainly don't know the "comment ID" or whatever you call it. And, for whatever reason, it was not listed as a hot topic.

Larry

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 24.237.143.4
Remote IP address: 24.237.143.4

EX-14111-03 LATE FILED

RECEIVED

From: Julie Kerssen
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, Mar 22, 2003 10:20 PM
Subject: Docket #02-277

MAR 25 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Commissioners:

I am writing to strongly urge you to retain the current rules regulating the media (re: docket #02-277). Media consolidation and monopoly is already a serious problem in this country, and the quality of information received by the public has suffered as a result. Comparing our media to that of other western countries makes the problem quite clear. Please help promote competition, diversity, and localism by not changing the rules to make mergers and monopoly even more likely.

Sincerely,

Julie Kerssen
1911 N 46th Street #302
Seattle, WA 98103

EX-100111 OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

From: Lee Konik
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Thu, Mar 20, 2003 6:25 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

MAR 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Lee Konik (lee.ann@radio411.com) writes:

Please help the radio industry. Jobs are being lost on a daily basis to voicetrackers from out-of-town who know nothing about the town they are voicetracking in. Diversity???? Perhaps more formats are offered, but if you look at the music charts, they're basically the same songs on a different format.

And IS THIS LEGAL??

from allaccess.com

The pimps at CLEAR CHANNEL Alternative WHRL (CHANNEL 103.1)/ALBANY, NY are offering labels the chance to have their music spotlighted on the station and prominently on the station's website in connection with its new specialty show, "VIRGIN MEAT." Each "VIRGIN MEAT" featured will get listed on the station's website, which includes: artist photo, tons of enticing text, up to three hyperlinks, audio, video, and whatever else you can think of to bust the hymen of your virgin tuneage! Also, your hot, sexy virgin gets 30 live mentions and 60 recorded mentions per month promoting channel1031.com and the VIRGIN MEAT feature.

And if that wasn't enough exposure for your VIRGIN MEAT, for a nominal additional cost, you could be the featured as the "VIRGIN OF THE MONTH." which means you get the main home page on CHANNEL 1031.COM with no other virgins around competing for attention. For cost and other info, call the pimps at WHRL: WALTER "DADDY-0" FLAKUS (518) 452-4827 OR LISA "GOT MY MONEY, HO?" BIELLO (518) 690-4772.

And, now with the big corporations, there is one person at headquarters dictating to all the company stations what songs to play. The Dixie Chicks removal from all Cumulus country stations is proof of that. Corporate radio has basically driven away the smarter listeners.

Thank you for listening. I **just** had to voice my opposition to deregulation. I currently work at a locally owned station and it is more a part of the community than the corporate stations I've worked at.

Thank you
Lee Ann Konik

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 209.136.114.12
Remote IP address: 209.136.114.12

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

From: Joshua Kolsky
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri. Mar 14, 2003 8:20 PM
Subject: FCC promote media diversity

MAR 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner Powell:

Numerous reports agree that the Federal Communications is planning to loosen longstanding rules governing control of the media that bring news and views to the American public. This will inevitably lead to monopoly, by a few large corporate giants, of TV stations, newspapers, and broadcast networks.

I urge you, Commissioner Powell, to halt immediately any implementation of these these FCC plans that threaten public access to diverse views and information

Sincerely,

Joshua **M.** Kolsky
2728 B Olive ST NW
Washington, DC 20007

EX-104119 OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

From: David LaFontaine
To: Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Mike Powell
Date: 3/16/03 8:29PM
Subject: Concentrated Media ownership - please vote no

MAR 25 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I don't expect anyone to really read beyond the header to this message, because your e-mailboxes will probably be clogged with millions of Spam messages from high-paid media conglomerate lobbyists.

However, let me add my voice, as weak as it is, to the faint chorus shouting "NO!" on this issue. Deregulation has proven to be disastrous to radio. And as we have seen in California, it's not such a good idea for the electricpower industry either.

Having worked in the media, for newspapers, magazines and television stations for more than 20 years, I can say that the single most noxious, frustrating and harmful to the public trend has been the corporatization of the media. The media affects how we see the world; that in turn affects our actions (or inactions) which in turns leads us into some dark alleys. Many of these are turning out to be in places like the Middle East, where our ignorance of political realities can be traced to corporate media's obsession with bottom-line profit - force-feeding the public mindless swill while studiously ignoring information that is essential.

The old excuse - "we only give the public what it wants" just won't wash here. News judgements should be made by people - not by what focus groups and demographic studies dictate.

If television/media are to actually live up to the dictum that they are to "broadcast in the public interest and good" (bad paraphrase, but bear with me on this one) should they not actually do something for the good of the public once in a while, rather than strictly for the good of their own already-bulging wallets?

For god's sake, vote no

David LaFontaine

EX-104-111-08 LATE FILED

RECEIVED

From: Braddon Lewellyn
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, Mar 22, 2003 7:16 PM
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

MAR 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner.

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Braddon Lewellyn
5855 N Kolb RD #2102
Tucson, AZ 85750

DO YOU YAHOO! Get your free @yahoo.com address at <http://lmail.yahoo.com>

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

From: Tracy Laibson
To: Mike Powell
Date: Wed, Mar 19, 2003 5:45 PM
Subject: FCC promote media diversity

MAR 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner Powell:

Numerous reports agree that the Federal Communications is planning to loosen longstanding rules governing control of the media that bring news and views to the American public. This will inevitably lead to monopoly, by a few large corporate giants, of TV stations, newspapers, and broadcast networks.

I urge you, Commissioner Powell, to halt immediately any implementation of these these FCC plans that threaten public access to diverse views and information.

Sincerely,

Tracy Laibson
3529 15th Avenue S
Minneapolis, MN 55407

DO YOU YAHOO! Get your free @yahoo.com address at <http://mail.yahoo.com>

EX PARTE OF LATE FILED RECEIVED

From: Rob Meyer
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy. KM KJMWEB
Date: Mon, Mar 17, 2003 6:51 AM
Subject: Broadcast Regulation and Media Ownership Rules, FCC Hearings

MAR 25 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Chairman Michael Powell, Commissioners Kathleen Abernathy and Kevin Martin Federal Communications Commission. Washington, DC

Dear Commissioners Abernathy. Martin and Powell:

I was fortunate enough to attend the FCC Field Hearing held at the University of Washington on Friday, March 7, 2003, a hearing which was held without your support, official recognition or funding by Chairman Powell. I have written Commissioners Adelstein and Copps to thank them for making the trip to Seattle and for soliciting input from the public and several professional panels, as was done in Richmond last month. I have also written my Congressional Representative and Senators to urge them to oppose what the F.C.C. is doing.

Sadly, that earlier hearing severely limited public comment, and was held with next to no notice and minimal publicity. I ask that you publicize the next hearing, to be held at Duke University later this month, and that all five members of the FCC make the short trip to Durham. Currently, about three quarters of the American public are unaware that the Commission is considering a further relaxation -- or total elimination -- of longstanding rules and regulations concerning media ownership consolidation, and compliance with already weakened FCC rules and regs.

As a broadcast professional with two decades of experience, mostly in radio news but other media as well, I have opposed further loosening of media regulation since the "genie first got out of the bottle" (to paraphrase Commissioner Copps) during the Reagan Administration. I opposed the Telecom Act of 1996 which has led to unprecedented consolidation of broadcast property ownership. I have written my Senators and U.S. House Representative on these issues, and I am encouraging everyone I know to do the same, no matter which side of the issue they may prefer.

I also am asking everyone I know to join me in asking you to add hearings and attend them as a full commission, with proper notice and greater publicity. Chairman Powell has been quoted as saying that the 15,000 comments received prior to the Seattle hearing was sufficient public input. Since our nation has over a quarter of a billion citizens -- all media consumers for whom the FCC's actions have vital consequences and to whom the FCC is answerable -- I respectfully submit that 15,000 public comments is NOT representative, or complete.

The original charge of the Federal Communications Commission, to protect the Public Interest with reasonable oversight of telecommunications services and broadcast media, has been whittled away for over two decades. To consider the complete elimination of rules, regulations and requirements for those owning access to our Public Trust -- the public spectrum -- is, to me, unconscionable. Already, **just** four corporations control 85% of the AM and FM frequencies in Seattle. Other markets, smaller and larger, have even more extreme consolidation. The idea of "local content" in news, and other programming, is all but disappearing. Diversity of voices and thought, much less of ownership, **is** a thing of the past.

It is said that the Bush Administration and your Commission seek to loosen or eliminate reasonable regulation to let the "free market" work in the media marketplace. It has been shown by study upon study that "competition" has not increased; it has decreased in broadcasting and other media. The argument that the internet and cable television provide reasonable alternatives **is false** -- a handful of corporations control access to those services, and the number of providers **is** increasingly integrated into multi-media mega-corporations. It is your responsibility to ensure Diversity Localism and Competition for media consumers, and to listen to those consumers.

I implore you to reach Out to the 72% of Americans who are unaware of the Commission's plans, and I encourage you to seek major media coverage of the issue, which has been sorely lacking. Could that be

because the owners of the major TV networks and other major media corporations are those who have lobbied you and the Bush Administration most strenuously to eliminate regulation? I think so. It is my belief that the vast majority of those whom you serve are dissatisfied with the current state of radio and television, the increasing homogeneity of programming, and an unchecked increase in vulgarity, obscenity and indecency on many airwaves and cable bands. Moreover, should they become informed of your plans, I believe the vast majority will join me in opposing unfettered amalgamation of media.

If your plan is to send the F.C.C. the way of the of the I.C.C.. the C.A.B. and other governmental regulatory agencies, you are doing a major disservice to the citizens to whom you should answer, and to whom you should listen. Please listen to those who pay your salaries, the citizens who rely on you to protect their Public Interest.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely.

Rob Meyer, Seattle

cc Cong. Jay Inslee, Cong. Jim McDermott, Interested Consumers

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Web Hosting - establish your business online

CC: Michael Copps. Commissioner Adelstein, George W. Bush, Maria Cantwell, Patty Murray

NOT RECORDED BY LATE FILED

From: Thomas Migdal
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, Mar 23, 2003 7:26 AM
Subject: Comments on deregulating the media markets

RECEIVED 5

MAR 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Powell

I am a 37-year-old male Operations Supervisor with a BS in Nuclear Engineering and an MBA in Finance. I also am an avid NPR listener and member.

The issue over concentrating ownership of multiple media markets disturbs me. Deregulating to allow more ownership of media seems dangerously homogenizing in terms of news content and entertainment.

I have scanned though multiple stations in my local market that not only play the same songs, they play them at the same time. I dislike the limited range of songs playing and feel that the huge stations water down their selections to placate the masses.

Example: Today (3/23/03) in Pittsburgh, PA I scanned through the stations and found the identical interview program on 93.7 FM and 107.9 FM at 6:30am in the morning. Both stations appear to be owned by Infinity Broadcasting. How I am I being served by having two stations in the same market broadcasting the same program?

The argument that a larger organization can provide more quality programming is flawed. The interview was with a doctor at a childrens hospital in Pittsburgh. The sound quality of the interview was poor because the interview was over the phone. If a local station were doing the coverage both the interviewer and interviewee would most probably be in the same room together at the station.

It was obvious that the interviewer was not a Pittsburgh native based on her unfamiliarity with local landmarks and the interviewer was also not well versed. She frequently ended her questions with ya know, or wow, uh-uh and it was apparent that her familiarity with the subject matter was limited.

I just want you to know that if you hear an argument from the big radio stations that because they are huge they can provide better service, beware. I was not impressed.

I vote **NO** for continued expansion of single ownership of the media markets. We probably have gone too far in what we have allowed already.

Thank you

Thomas Migdal
102 Brian Drive
Beaver, PA 15009

RECEIVED

Protect your PC - get McAfee.com VirusScan Online
<http://lclinic.mcafee.com/lcliniclibuy/campaign.asp?cid=3963>

MAR 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

MB 02-277

From: Curtis Marquardson
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB. Commissioner
Adelstein
Date: Thu. Mar 20, 2003 10:21 AM
Subject: THE MEDIA

RECEIVED

MAR 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

To whom this may concern,

Well you probably have received many emails regarding this matter, however I would like to express that I think the media has way to much control over any issues.

I do not think they should know how many troops we have where we are striking, what we can expect and on and on and on. Why aren't you protecting our troops? There safety resides in your hands know if they are hurt it will be your fault. They are like rabid dogs trying to "get the scoop" and I think they are out of control. Why don't they just give all Saddam our military secrets. On the news last night I heard them say how many tomahawks(40) come from 8 ships.

Well good old Saddam can thank the media for all those secrets!!!

When are you going to limit their ability to get all the info?

I think it's sad the media knows before the chain of command in the military knows. Sham on you! And sham on the media.

Sincerely,
Curtis Marquardson
A very devoted American

CC: Megan Olson

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

From: Michael Mullarkey
To: Mike Powell
Date: 3/7/03 5:07PM
Subject: Plans to deregulate the media

MAR 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Chairman Powell:

I write to you as a part owner of America's airwaves. The suggestion to allow large corporate interests to control the access to information through expanded ownership of print and broadcast media can only serve to corrode our democratic process. The major television stations accessible to the citizens of Seattle are owned and controlled by three large corporations: FOX, General Electric and Disney. The homogeneity of our news content reflects their corporate perspective.

It **is** no accident that the issue of information deregulation has been discussed on public radio and television and assiduously avoided by all commercial broadcasters.

I **do** not want my news and my airways controlled by powerful financial interests, be they the New York Times or the corporations of Rupert Murdoch.

Sincerely,

Michael Mullarkey, M.D.
1422 8th Avenue West
Seattle, WA 98119
telephone: 206-285-0340
facsimile: 206-285-7070
e-mail: mike70m@speakeasy.org

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED **RECEIVED**

02-277
MB-02-277

From: Danika Nieves
To: Mike Powell
Date: Thu. Mar 13.2003 11:07 AM
Subject: FCC promote media diversity

MAR 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner Powell:

Numerous reports agree that the Federal Communications is planning to loosen longstanding rules governing control of the media that bring news and views to the American public. This will inevitably lead to monopoly, by a few large corporate giants, of TV stations, newspapers, and broadcast networks

I urge you, Commissioner Powell, to halt immediately any implementation of these these FCC plans that threaten public access to diverse views and information.

Sincerely

Danika Nieves
100 Seward ST. Apt. B10
Rockaway. NJ 07866

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED;

From: Le'Var Norsworthy
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, Mar 15, 2003 7:06 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

MAR 25 2003

~~Federal Communications Commission~~
Office of the Secretary

Le'Var Norsworthy (www.staleeon@blackplanet.com) writes:

Dear Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

In referring back to the press release on FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION ISSUES BIENNIAL REGULATORY REVIEW REPORT FOR THE YEAR 2002, it stated that a reveiw is required in order to critique regulations and determine as to if they are still relevant. The relevant nature is that in many instances in government agencies is the economic standings. How do you think the economic influenes will affect the FCC's decisions in the future?

Thank you for your time!

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 205.129.164.35
Remote IP address: 205.129.164.35

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

From: Robert Owren
To: Mike Powell
Date: 3/9/03 3:32PM
Subject: March 13 mtg.

MAR 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I strongly oppose any further consolidation of the people's airwaves to large corporate interests. The move to put more control of our frequencies into fewer and fewer hands, is an extremely disconcerting development.

We need to hear more voices, not fewer.

I am very disturbed by the present move of a few powerful and wealthy companies that seek to monopolize all of our information sources.

You are the guardians of "the public's airwaves." Please, do not sell our freedom of choice to the "money changers."

Robert L. Owren
23404 26th Ave. S.
Des Moines, WA 98198

EX-100-000000-000000-000000

From: M Peachw
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, Mar 21, 2003 11:06AM
Subject: Don't allow monopoly of media channels

RECEIVED

MAR 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner Powell:

Numerous reports agree that the Federal Communications is planning to loosen longstanding rules governing control of the media that bring news and views to the American public. This will inevitably lead to monopoly, by a few large corporate giants, of TV stations, newspapers, and broadcast networks.

I urge you, Commissioner Powell, to halt immediately any implementation of these these FCC plans that threaten public access to diverse views and information.

Sincerely

M. Peachw
7118 Fuller CR
Ft. Worth, TX 76133

DO YOU YAHOO! Get your free @yahoo.com address at
<http://mailyahoo.com>

EX-100/111 OR DATE FILED

RECEIVED

From: Dorothea Salo
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, Mar 16, 2003 10:33 AM
Subject: FCC promote media diversity

MAR 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner Powell.

Numerous reports agree that the Federal Communications is planning to loosen longstanding rules governing control of the media that bring news and views to the American public. This will inevitably lead to monopoly, by a few large corporate giants, of TV stations, newspapers, and broadcast networks.

I urge you, Commissioner Powell, to halt immediately any implementation of these these FCC plans that threaten public access to diverse views and information.

Sincerely.

Dorothea Salo
206 S Midvale BLVD
Madison, WI 53705

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

MB 02-277

From: Doug Silver
To: Doug Silver
Date: Thu, Mar 20, 2003 10:46 AM
Subject: Media giant's rally sponsorship raises questions. This is another reason why media consolidation is

Sponsored by

RECEIVED

MAR 25 2003

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/showcase/chi-030319O157mar19.story>

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Media giant's rally sponsorship raises questions

Advertisement

By Tim Jones
Tribune national correspondent

March 19, 2003

Some of the biggest rallies this month have endorsed President Bush's strategy against Saddam Hussein, and the common thread linking most of them is Clear Channel Worldwide Inc., the nation's largest owner of radio stations.

In a move that has raised eyebrows in some legal and journalistic circles, Clear Channel radio stations in Atlanta, Cleveland, San Antonio, Cincinnati and other cities have sponsored rallies attended by up to 20,000 people. The events have served as a loud rebuttal to the more numerous but generally smaller anti-war rallies.

The sponsorship of large rallies by Clear Channel stations is unique among major media companies, which have confined their activities in the war debate to reporting and occasionally commenting on the news. The San Antonio-based broadcaster owns more than 1,200 stations in 50 states and the District of Columbia.

While labor unions and special interest groups have organized and hosted rallies for decades, the involvement of a big publicly regulated broadcasting company breaks new ground in public demonstrations.

"I think this is pretty extraordinary," said former Federal Communications Commissioner Glen Robinson, who teaches law at the University of Virginia. "I can't say that this violates any of a broadcaster's obligations, but it sounds like borderline manufacturing of the news."

A spokeswoman for Clear Channel said the rallies, called "Rally for America," are the idea of Glenn Beck, a Philadelphia talk show host whose program is syndicated by Premier Radio Networks, a Clear Channel subsidiary.

'Just patriotic rallies'

A weekend rally in Atlanta drew an estimated 20,000 people, with some carrying signs reading "God Bless the USA and other signs condemning France and the group Dixie Chicks, one of whose members recently criticized President Bush.

"They're not intended to be pro-military. It's more of a thank you to the troops. They're just patriotic rallies," said Clear Channel spokeswoman Lisa Dollinger.

Rallies sponsored by Clear Channel radio stations are scheduled for this weekend in Sacramento, Charleston, S.C., and Richmond, Va. Although Clear Channel promoted two of the recent rallies on its corporate Web site, Dollinger said there is no corporate directive that stations organize rallies.

"Any rallies that our stations have been a part of have been of their own initiative and in response to the expressed desires of their listeners and communities," Dollinger said.

Clear Channel is by far the largest owner of radio stations in the nation. The company owned only 43 in 1995, but when Congress removed many of the ownership limits in 1996, Clear Channel was quickly on the highway to radio dominance. The company owns and operates 1,233 radio stations (including six in Chicago) and claims 100 million listeners. Clear Channel generated about 20 percent of the radio industry's \$16 billion in 2001 revenues.

Size sparks criticism

The media giant's **size** also has generated criticism. Some recording artists have charged that Clear Channel's dominance in radio and concert promotions is hurting the recording industry. Congress is investigating the effects of radio consolidation. And the FCC is considering ownership rule changes, among them changes that could allow Clear Channel to expand its reach.

Sen. Russell Feingold (D-Wis.) has introduced a bill that could halt further deregulation in the radio industry and limit each company's audience share and percent of advertising dollars. These measures could limit Clear Channel's meteoric growth and hinder its future profitability.

Jane Kirtley, a professor of media ethics and law at the University of Minnesota, said the company's support of the Bush administration's policy toward Iraq makes it "hard to escape the concern that this may in part be motivated by issues that Clear Channel has before the FCC and Congress."

Dollinger denied there is a connection between the rallies and the company's pending regulatory matters.

Rick Morris, an associate professor of communications at Northwestern University, said these actions by Clear Channel stations are a logical extension of changes in the radio industry over the last 20 years, including the blurring of lines between journalism and entertainment.

From a business perspective, Morris said, the rallies are a natural fit for many stations, especially talk-radio stations where hosts usually espouse politically conservative views.

"Nobody should be surprised by this," Morris said

In 1987 the FCC repealed the Fairness Doctrine, which required broadcasters to cover controversial issues in their community and to do so by offering balancing views. With that obligation gone, Morris said, "radio can behave more like newspapers, with opinion pages and editorials."

"They've just begun stretching their legs, being more politically active," Morris said.

Copyright (c) 2003, Chicago Tribune

Improved archives!

Searching Chicagotribune.com archives back to 1985 is cheaper and easier than ever. New prices for multiple articles can bring your cost as low as 30 cents an article: <http://www.chicagotribune.com/archives>

APR 03 09:55 AM
FBI - SEATTLE
APR 03 09:55 AM
FBI - SEATTLE

From: Gregory Vouras
To: Mike Powell
Date: 3/6/03 9:55PM
Subject: Station Ownership

RECEIVED

MAR 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question, and I strongly oppose the change in rules that would enable the huge companies in the broadcast industry to increase their market share. We MUST retain limits on the ownership of radio and TV stations.

While there may be indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented have become more limited. A few large communication monopolies now control the vast majority of stations. This is clearly an attempt to control the public's access to unbiased information. History has shown that too much power and control by a chosen few has disastrous results.

The right to carry on informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that a diverse marketplace of ideas best served democracy. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge, our ability to have open, informed discussion with a wide variety of viewpoints will be severely compromised.

The public interest will best be served by preserving media ownership rules in question in this proceeding.

In addition to the official hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA. I strongly urge the FCC to hold additional hearings elsewhere around the nation to solicit the widest possible participation from the public which will be the most directly affected by the outcomes of these decisions. It is vital for the FCC to not only consider the points of view of those with a financial interest in this issue, but also those with a social or civic interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is incumbent on the Commission to take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process. This appears to be yet one more way in which the Bush administration is destroying our civil liberties and right to know, and I am very concerned about to what extent this autocratic philosophy will be implemented

Thank you,

Gregory Vouras
2120 - 8th Avenue West
Seattle, WA 98119

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

From: Lw331@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: 3/7/03 3:44PM
Subject: reform needed

MAR 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear FCC Chairman:

We are experiencing too much control of our media by too few companies, controlled by too few people, and with too little diversity or perspective in programming. The current system **is** unfair to consumers and threatens our democracy. Please fix the system so it has the best interests of consumers and democracy in mind, not the best interests of corporations.

Thank you for your help

Sincerely,
Catherine Workman
331 E. Magnolia St. #1F
Fort Collins, CO 80524

From: jayrice1@earthlink.net
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, Mar 23, 2003 4:35 PM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

U.S. PART OF LATE FILED

RECEIVED

MAR 25 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein.

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected

Sincerely,

Jay Rice
72 Holstrom Circle
Novato, California 94947-2075

cc:
Senator Dianne Feinstein
Senator Barbara Boxer
Representative Lynn Woolsey